STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DIVERSITY ISSUES IN THE ARMY AS PERCEIVED BY ARMY STUDENTS AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL CECIL R. WEBSTER
United States Army

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

USAWC CLASS OF 1997

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

19970623 043

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

DIVERSITY ISSUES IN THE ARMY AS PERCEIVED
BY ARMY STUDENTS AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

by

Lieutenant Colonel Cecil R. Webster

United States Army

Colonel Morris E. Price, Jr.

Project Advisor

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Cecil R. Webster (LTC), USA

TITLE: DIVERSITY ISSUES IN THE ARMY AS PERCEIVED BY ARMY
            STUDENTS AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 7 March 1997   Pages: 74   CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The scope of this strategic research project developed from a minor rift between

the Black and White officers in the United States Army War College (USAWC) Class of

1997. The rift arose over the possible depiction of the Confederate Battle Flag in a Civil

War print that the Class commissioned. This 'flag' issue, as well as other class

discussions on social and domestic programs, highlighted significant differences of

opinion between Blacks and Whites on equal opportunity, affirmative action, welfare, and

other related programs. In recognizing this diversity, this paper identifies some diversity

issues within the Army, analyzes the perception of those diversity issues by the resident

Army students in the USAWC Class of 1997 (the future strategic leaders of the Army),

and recommends strategies for eliminating or reducing any negative effects which may

result from these differences of perception.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

DIVERSITY ISSUES IN THE ARMY AS PERCEIVED
BY ARMY STUDENTS AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

In 1994 in The Tyranny of the Majority Lani Guinier relates the story of why Black[1]

and White boys at a parochial high school in Chicago attended separate senior proms two

years earlier.[2] This situation arose due to a lack of consideration between the desires of

the majority and the wishes of the minority. The prom committee, via popular vote, hired

a disc jockey, picked a rock band, and selected all the prom music. As the high school

was predominately White and the prom committee was all White, the Black students,

although given a vote, were not able to affect the composition of the prom committee or

the vote for the disc jockey, the band, or the type of songs to be played. "As one [B]lack

student put it: 'For every vote we had, there were eight votes for what they wanted

...[W]ith us being in the minority we're always outvoted. It's as if we don't count.'"[3]

Thus, Black students responded by organizing and attending their own prom. "Some

embittered [W]hite seniors saw things differently. They complained that the [B]lack

students should have gone along with the majority: 'The majority makes [the] decision.

That's the way it works.'"[4] Needless to say, any cohesiveness between the groups was

likely set aback somewhat.

In many respects the same situation occurred between the Black and White students

of the United States Army War College (USAWC) Class of 1997. Based on student

suggestions and popular voting, the class initially considered numerous recommendations

for gifts to the College (stained glass window, statuette, art print, money contribution,

etc). Through succeeding popular votes, this initial list was whittled down to an art print with an undefined theme.

Most of the Black students preferred a non-Civil War theme (e.g., Desert Storm) for this print.[5] Unfortunately for them, they represented less than ten percent of the class. They did not have enough voting power or persuasive ability to effectively affect the outcome of the voting. Ultimately, the class selected a Civil War theme. The Black students then focused their attention on ensuring that the Confederate Battle Flag would not be displayed in the art print. Like Blacks in prior War College classes, most of the Blacks in the class objected to the depiction of the Confederate Battle Flag. To them, this flag represents an everyday reminder of past and present racism and prejudice against minorities. Many Whites, on the other hand, view the Confederate Battle Flag as simply an artifact of the past. They profess that in order to accurately portray a Civil War theme, the Confederate Battle Flag must be displayed in the print. Thus, the clash of opinion between the Blacks and the Whites. Unlike the prom incident, however, the groups compromised. The print is being developed without a Confederate Battle Flag.

Lani Guinier, in acknowledging that both prom groups were probably right in their positions [and by inference, the same could be said of the War College students], expressed the sentiment that each group probably felt: "From the [W]hite students' perspective, this was ordinary decisionmaking. To the [B]lack students, majority rule sent the message: 'we don't count' [and that] is the 'way it works' for minorities. In a racially divided society, majority rule may be perceived as majority tyranny."[6] More importantly, she asserts that "the fundamental important question of political stability is

how to induce [the] losers to continue to play the game... When the minority experiences the alienation of complete and consistent defeat, they lack incentive to respect laws passed by the majority over their opposition."[7]

Like the incident with the high school prom students, the issue with the Confederate Battle Flag probably caused more acrimony between the students than it deserved. Unfortunately, however, it appears to be indicative of feelings at-large on diversity issues most important to minorities and females -- issues that minorities and females feel they have little control over.

As the student officers in this class transition to strategic leadership of the Army (e.g., promotion to general officers) over the next 5-15 years, they will make policy decisions on diversity issues which are important to the Army in general, and to minorities and females in particular. As they make these decisions, they must be cognizant of the impact these decisions might have on the attitudes and perceptions of other Army leaders as well as the Total Army. For this reason, this strategy research project examines the racial and gender differences in perceptions and attitudes of senior Army leaders, as exhibited by the Army students in this USAWC class on a host of diversity issues.

This author's hypothesis is that there are significant differences in perception on diversity issues between Blacks and Whites, between males and females, and to a smaller extent, between branch groupings (combat arms, combat support, and combat service support). These perceptions, however, are not endemic to just the Army -- American society in general seems to suffer this same malaise. This author contends that unless

3

these perceptions are adequately addressed and resolved, this 'cancer' will continue to spread and affect the Army's ability to execute its "Army Vision 2010."

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The U.S. Army has long been sensitive to the attitudes and perceptions of its force toward equal treatment and opportunity for Blacks, other minorities, and women. The direction and degree of that sensitivity has drastically changed over the years. In 1925 Major General E.H. Ely, Commandant, USAWC, proposed an Army policy that said the Negro "... has not the initiative and resourcefulness of the [W]hite man [and] he is mentally inferior to the [W]hite man."[8] Additionally, "Negro soldiers as individuals should not be assigned to [W]hite units [and] Negro officers should not be placed over [W]hite officers, noncommissioned officers or soldiers."[9] By 1950 the official position of the Army leadership had changed to the point that "all Army jobs [were] now open to Negroes [and] the 10 percent limitation on Negro strength [was] abolished."[10]

By the early 1970s the Department of the Army and the U.S. Army Research Institute were regularly conducting surveys gauging the perceptions and success of equal opportunity and equal treatment in the Army from both White and Black perspectives. A 1973 Army survey reported that "when questions are asked about racial perceptions and attitudes, the [B]lack-and-[W]hite responses are almost invariably significantly different."[11] Furthermore, it reports:

> "The survey results show that a distinct cleavage exists with respect to how the race problem is perceived. Whites in the Army tend to buy the proposition that the Army is, as its basic policy says it is, free from racial discrimination. Blacks, on the other hand, see the Army as highly discriminatory by race. This difference is also correlated with grade, such that officers and higher enlisted grades tend to see the race problem as less serious than do the lower enlisted

grades. The overall result is that the majority view and the view of Army leadership tends to be that the race problem in the Army is not really a serious problem. This predominating view tends to mask and obscure the fact that the dissenting view is held by those who are the victims of racial discrimination -- the racial minority."[12]

More recently, in an April 1995 report to Congressman Ronald V. Dellums, Ranking Minority Member on the Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, the Government Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed 72 studies developed by the Army, Air Force, and Navy. These reports, dating from 1974 to 1994, related to perceptions of equal opportunity and discrimination in the military. As women were being integrated into the total force in ever-increasing numbers, surveys of attitudes and perceptions relative to them were conducted as well. The following are some of the general observations submitted by the GAO on diversity:

> "Blacks and women tended to hold negative perceptions regarding equal opportunity in the military. Poor training and lack of visible chain of command participation led to decreased emphasis on the Army's equal opportunity program. Sexual harassment is a problem in all services, and efforts to prevent it have not been totally effective. Most victims did not take formal action because they anticipated a negative outcome. Many of the studies found that [W]hite males had the most positive perception about the equal opportunity climate and [B]lacks the least positive perceptions. Minorities and females generally perceived less opportunity for advancement, promotion, and fairness in discipline."[13]

As a result of these types of surveys, the Army leadership has come to better understand and appreciate the perceptions and attitudes of minorities on equal opportunity and treatment in the military. Over the last several years, however, many minorities and females have been vehement in expressing their opinion that the United States has retrenched in enforcing and maintaining the policies and programs minorities and women rely on to ensure equal opportunity and treatment.[14] Likewise, many

minorities and women in the Army today privately express their feelings that the future executive leaders of the Army, as represented by the Army students in this War College class, are not as sensitive or attuned to diversity issues as others have been in the past. It is this thesis which forms the basis for this research.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENT

To ascertain whether there exists statistically significant differences in perceptions by the future leadership of the Army on diversity issues, the author surveyed the resident Army students in the U.S. Army War College Class of 1997. Surveys were distributed through student mailboxes to the 231 Army students -- 125 completed surveys were eventually returned (a 54% response rate). The average age of the Army students at the beginning of the class was 44 years. They have an average of 21 years of Army service.

The survey consisted of 34 questions.[15] The first 29 questions sought respondent perceptions and attitudes in the following diversity areas and issues:

Army Equal Opportunity and Treatment (EOT) Policies
- Current Perceptions on Race and Gender Relations
- Perceptions on Successfulness of EOT
- Possible EOT Implementation Strategies
- Degree of Racial and Gender Discrimination

Selected Diversity Issues
- Mentoring and Professional Development
- Sexual Harassment
- Women and Combat
- Minorities and Female Sensitivities to Race/Gender
- Confederacy Related Issues
- Homosexuals and the Army

During survey analysis, several of the questions were expanded for a more detailed review of the results. Thus, the 29 substantive survey questions evolved into 46 separate questions. Each question offered multiple-choice type responses, as well as space to submit written comments. The remaining five (5) survey questions requested respondent background information (race, sex, category of service, branch, and component of service). Shown in Figure 1 are demographics of the Army students in the class, as well as demographics data on survey respondents.

The next section of this report presents an overview of the questions and responses. Each diversity question and issue includes results in figure form. Each figure lists the number of students responding to that question, and based on that number, student perceptions (by percentages selecting each response) in terms of the overall responses and responses by race, gender, and branch of service. Additionally, where appropriate, the figure lists the mean score[16] for each group.

Due to small target audience populations or insufficient survey responses from some groups (minority groups other than Blacks, and females), meaningful data comparisons can be made only between Blacks and Whites and by branch.[17] Therefore, other than presenting the data representing the limited views of these 'Other' minorities and females, few comparative comments are offered. This data is shaded to reflect its limited use.

FIGURE 1. DEMOGRAPHICS

AWC REPORTED DIVERSITY	DIVERSITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Category of Service	Quantity	Percent
Military	221	95.7
DA Civilian	10	4.3
Total	231	100.0

Category of Service	Quantity	Percent
Military	120	96.0
Civilian	4	3.2
Not Reported	1	0.8
Total	125	100.0

Component	Quantity	Percent
Regular Army	187	84.6
Army Reserve	14	6.3
National Guard	20	9.0
Total	221	100.0

Component	Quantity	Percent
Regular Army	120	96.0
Army Reserve	1	0.8
National Guard	0	0.0
Not Reported	4	3.2
Total	125	100.0

Branch Breakout	Quantity	Percent
Combat Arms	114	51.6
Combat Support	45	20.4
Combat Service Support	41	18.6
Special Branches	6	2.7
Medical Branches	15	6.8
Total	221	100.0

Branch	Quantity	Percent
Combat Arms	54	43.2
Combat Support	25	20.0
Combat Service Support (Incl Spec/Med Branch)	41	32.8
Not Reported	5	4.0
Total	125	100.0

Race	Quantity	Percent
White/Caucasian	192	83.1
Black/African-American	25	10.8
Hispanic	9	3.9
Asian	1	0.4
Other	4	1.7
Total	231	100.0

Race	Quantity	Percent
White/Caucasian	94	75.2
Black/African-American	19	15.2
Hispanic	4	3.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	1.6
Other Minorities	4	3.2
Not Reported	2	1.6
Total	125	100.0

Gender	Quantity	Percent
Female	18	7.8
Male	213	92.2
Total	231	100.0

Gender	Quantity	Percent
Female	12	9.6
Male	112	89.6
Not Reported	1	0.8
Total	125	100.0

(Source: USAWC Student Operations, 5 Dec 96)   (Source: Survey Results, 13 Jan 97)

In determining the degree of statistical significance difference between Black and White responses and between branches, the author employed the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) technique.[18] Statistical significance between the groups was achieved when $p < .05$ (i.e., the probability of finding the difference by chance was less than 5 in 100, or 0.05).[19] Below each table is the associated probability level, based on race and branch differences.

In addition to the analytical data, literally volumes of written comments were received. Relevant and representative survey comments are integrated into the discussion of the analytical data.[20] Most of the comments received were opposed to positions stated in the survey questions. Therefore, most of the 'representative' comments presented are also against the issues raised.

SURVEY RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Of the 46 substantive survey questions, statistically significant differences exist between Black and White perceptions on 27 questions (over 55%). These differences indicated differences in strength of agreement or conviction. In terms of differences by branch only 2 responses fall into the statistically significant difference category (less than 5%). The discussion below follows the order of the questions as presented on the survey. As each is discussed, it will be noted as to whether the responses by race are significantly different or not. Unless specifically mentioned, branch differences in perceptions are not significantly different.

Issues Relating to Army Equal Opportunity and Treatment (EOT) Policies

This section relates to questions on current perceptions of race and gender relations in the Army and in the civilian community, the success of Army EOT policies, and attitudes toward possible EOT strategies. The section wraps up with respondent perceptions on whether he/she has been discriminated against.

Current perceptions on race and gender relations.

Respondents were asked to characterize how they perceived race and gender relations in the Army. Each was also asked to compare military race and gender relations to civilian race and gender relations. Of the four questions in this category, Black and White responses were significantly different on three questions (Questions 1, 2, and 3). There were no significant differences in either of the four questions by branch perception.

Army race relations. Statistically significant differences exist between Black and White perceptions of race relations in the Army (Figure 2). Overall, 90% of all Army students consider race relations to be good (78%) or excellent (12%). However, due to the relative ratio of Whites to Blacks, this perception is largely 'White.'

When viewed from the perspective of race, the results are quite different. While only 5% of Whites characterized race relations as fair, over 26 % of Blacks characterized it that way. Likewise, Whites characterized race relations as good 81% of the time, while Blacks did so only 68% of the time. Furthermore, no Blacks characterized race relations as excellent -- 14% of Whites did. Based on the mean score of Whites, Whites are solid in their perception that race relations are 'good.' Blacks tend to agree that race relations

are somewhat good too, but to a much less extent. This is a significant difference, however.

That same degree of difference is not evident from a branch perspective. As the overall response reflects a largely White perception, so do the responses by branch. As a result, the combat arms, combat support, and combat service support aggregate responses are approximately the same as the White responses -- race relations are solidly characterized as 'good.'

Figure 2. Question 1: How would you characterize the "state of race relations" in the Army today? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		*124*	*93*	*19*	*10*	*11*	*112*	*54*	*25*	*40*
Extremely Poor	*1*									
Poor	*2*	0.8%		5.3%			0.9%	1.9%		
Fair	*3*	8.9%	5.4%	26.3%			8.9%	7.4%	8.0%	7.5%
Good	*4*	78.2%	80.6%	68.4%	80.0%	90.9%	77.7%	74.1%	80.0%	85.0%
Excellent	*5*	12.1%	14.0%		20.0%	9.1%	12.5%	16.7%	12.0%	7.5%
Mean Score			*4.0860*	*3.6316*				*4.0556*	*4.0400*	*4.0000*

$p_{(W/B)} = .0002$ (SD) $\qquad$ $p_{(Br)} = .8603$ (No SD)

(Note: SD = Significant Difference)

Written survey comments, although few on this specific question, further highlight these differences:

> "Finally, I think most 'whites' see race relations as far more positive than do 'non-whites' and that's a damn shame. Until we can change that feeling/fact/perception, we'll never be where we want to be (i.e., gender/color blind)." [Survey 79]

> "After considerable reflection and discussion this year, I believe we collectively are unwilling to discuss the hot topics and emotional perceptions of all because it's too unnerving and painful." [Survey 106]

After giving their perceptions on the state of current Army race relations, respondents were then asked to compare that to civilian race relations.

Army race relations vs civilian race relations. Like the differences in perceptions of Army race relations by race, similar significant differences exist in the perception of Army race relations when compared to civilian race relations (Figure 3). Whites perceived Army race relations to be 'much better' than civilian race relations -- approximately 80% responded that way. Blacks, on the other hand, perceived Army race relations to be only 'better' than civilian race relations. Like before, the extent of their perceptions and the mean of their respective responses highlighted these significant differences in perceptions.

Similar to the previous branch perceptions of race relations, there was not a significant difference in perception between combat arms, combat support, and combat service support respondents. Each tended to reflect the predominate White viewpoint that race relations in the Army were 'much better' than in the civilian community.

Figure 3. Question 2: How would you characterize the "state of race relations" in the Army as compared to the civilian community? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	93	19	10	12	111	53	25	41
Civilian Much Better	1	0.8%		5.3%			0.9%			2.4%
Civilian Better	2									
Both About Same	3	3.2%	2.2%	10.5%		8.3%	2.7%	1.9%		4.9%
Army Better	4	21.8%	18.3%	42.1%	10.0%	25.0%	20.7%	24.5%	20.0%	17.1%
Army Much Better	5	74.2%	79.6%	42.1%	90.0%	66.7%	75.7%	73.6%	80.0%	75.6%
Mean Score			4.7742	4.1579				4.7170	4.8000	4.6341

$p_{(W/B)} = .0001$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .5492$ (No SD)

Next, the previous two questions were repeated, but the issue was gender relations, not race relations.

Army gender relations. Like their responses to the 'Army race relations' question, Blacks characterized gender relations in the Army as somewhat 'fair' (Figure 4). Whites tended to characterize it as 'good.' Thus, although both are positive in their characterizations, Blacks are positive to a much less positive extent than Whites. This is a significant difference.

As before, by branch the differences are insignificant. Each branch perception tended to be 'good.'

Figure 4. Question 3: How would you characterize the "state of gender relations" in the Army today? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Extremely Poor	1									
Poor	2	2.4%	1.1%	10.5%			2.7%	1.9%	4.0%	2.4%
Fair	3	24.0%	21.3%	42.1%	10.0%	41.7%	21.4%	14.8%	16.0%	36.6%
Good	4	65.6%	68.1%	47.4%	80.0%	50.0%	67.9%	72.2%	76.0%	53.7%
Excellent	5	8.0%	9.6%		10.0%	8.3%	8.0%	11.1%	4.0%	7.3%
Mean Score			3.8617	3.3684				3.9259	3.8000	3.6585

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0014 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .1074 (No SD)

Army gender relations vs civilian gender relations. For the first time, there were no significant differences in perceptions by Blacks and Whites in their characterization of gender relations in the Army as compared to civilian gender relations (Figure 5). Both believed that military gender relations were 'better.' The same was true from a branch view.

Figure 5. Question 4: How would you characterize the "state of gender relations" in the Army as compared to the civilian community? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	93	19	10	12	111	53	25	41
Civilian Much Better	1									
Civilian Better	2	4.0%	4.3%	5.3%		16.7%	2.7%	3.8%		4.9%
Both About Same	3	19.4%	20.4%	26.3%		33.3%	18.0%	17.0%	16.0%	24.4%
Military Better	4	30.6%	28.0%	36.8%	30.0%	8.3%	32.4%	32.1%	36.0%	24.4%
Military Much Better	5	46.0%	47.3%	31.6%	70.0%	41.7%	46.8%	47.2%	48.0%	46.3%
Mean Score			4.1828	3.9474				4.2264	4.3200	4.1220

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .3057 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .6626 (No SD)

As a result of the responses to these race and gender relations questions, it is evident that Blacks and Whites have two distinct differences in perceptions. Whites tend to be much more positive in characterizing race and gender relations than Blacks. This is the same observation noted by the GAO in the report mentioned earlier. By branch, there were no significant differences in perceptions.

Given their responses to race and gender relations questions, the respondents were then asked to characterize their perceptions of the success of Army equal opportunity and equal treatment policies.

Perceptions on successfulness of equal opportunity and treatment.

The four questions in this area involved perceptions in: the success of Army equal opportunity and treatment policies; the intent of Army equal opportunity and treatment policies; and the degree to which specific groups have been helped most and helped least by equal opportunity and treatment policies. As the questions on specific racial and

gender groups are in effect separate questions, 16 questions were derived from the four basic questions. Given those 16 questions, Black and White responses were significantly different on only four questions (Questions 6, 7b, 8a, and 8b). There were no significant differences in responses by branch.

Army success in implementing equal opportunity. Like differences in perceptions on race and gender relations, Whites tended to be much more optimistic and positive about the success of Army equal opportunity policies and programs -- much more so than the minority beneficiaries of these programs and policies (Figure 6). Whites tended to indicate that these policies have been 'very successful'. As a matter of fact, several Whites expressed the opinion that these policies have gone beyond that required for equal opportunity and treatment "to the point of reverse discrimination" [Survey 96]. Blacks tended to believe that these policies have been only 'somewhat successful.' As before, although both are positive in their outlook, their differences are nevertheless significant in extent of perception.

Branch perceptions were not significantly different. Like the White responses, each group tended to characterize the equal opportunity policies as being 'very successful' as opposed to simply 'somewhat successful.'

Figure 6. Question 5: How successful has the Army been in implementing equal opportunity?
(Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		*124*	*93*	*19*	*10*	*12*	*111*	*53*	*25*	*41*
Very Unsuccessful	*1*									
Somewhat Unsuccessful	*2*									
Neither Successful nor Unsuccessful	*3*	2.4%	1.1%	10.5%			2.7%	1.9%	8.0%	
Somewhat Successful	*4*	36.3%	32.3%	52.6%	40.0%	75.0%	32.4%	34.0%	24.0%	43.9%
Very Successful	*5*	61.3%	66.7%	36.8%	60.0%	25.0%	64.9%	64.2%	68.0%	56.1%
Mean Score			*4.6559*	*4.2632*				*4.6226*	*4.6000*	*4.5610*

$p_{(W/B)} = .0038$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .8624$ (No SD)

Numerous written comments were received on this question. The below representative comments highlight the differences in perceptions from a race perspective.

"I do believe, however, that the Army often takes race/gender-related equal opportunity issues and plausible action plans to the extreme." [Survey 8]

"Although far from perfect, overall the Army has had relatively good success with racial/ethnic equality, primarily because leadership intolerance of discrimination and exposure to blacks and other minorities in leadership positions and while working side-by-side with them." [Survey 89]

"As mentioned, I believe there is actual reverse discrimination in the Army today to our detriment. Being politically correct doesn't put the best person in the right job.... There isn't room for (racism) in our force. But likewise, special minority groups/clubs are confrontational in promoting separatism and racial conflict. We emphasize Afro-American Month, Native American/Hispanic, etc. What happened to good old Joe American day? This is supposed to be a melting pot." [Survey 96]

"As an Indian I believe I've gotten more than a fair shake out of this Army. The organization as a whole serves as a model for EO in society." [Survey 99]

"The perception among many non-minority military officers is that there is not racism in today's Armed Forces and that minority officers are less qualified than they are the beneficiaries of affirmative action or preferential treatment. Their idea of a level playing field is to just let the system work. The system 'worked' for decades before legislation was passed to provide opportunities to minorities

16

that previously did not exist. Benjamin O. Davis, Sr was not the first Black man who was qualified to become a general officer. There are many other examples. The system that discriminated does not work for all. The playing field has to be leveled to be level. If minorities are not protected from discrimination, we may end up losing the ground we've gained." [Survey 105]

After giving their perception on how successful the Army's equal opportunity policies have been, the respondents then indicated to what extent they thought these programs were designed to help each of the minority and female groups.

Intent of equal opportunity policies. In terms of which groups the equal opportunity policies were designed to assist, the responses by race and by branch were consistent (Figures 7-11). Both Blacks and Whites, as well as each of the branch groupings, indicated that they thought Army equal opportunity policies were designed to help minorities and females more than Whites. Furthermore, based on the means of their responses, each group perceived that the focus of these programs were 'to a great extent' towards Blacks, followed by women, Hispanics, other ethnic minorities, and then Whites.

Figure 7. Question 6a: To what extent were Army Equal Opportunity (EO) policies intended to help Whites? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	94	18	10	12	111	54	24	41
Not Applicable	1	38.7%	42.6%	27.8%	30.0%	33.3%	39.6%	35.2%	50.0%	39.0%
To A Little Extent	2	40.3%	38.3%	50.0%	40.0%	33.3%	40.5%	44.4%	25.0%	43.9%
To A Moderate Extent	3	13.7%	10.6%	16.7%	30.0%	16.7%	13.5%	14.8%	16.7%	9.8%
To A Great Extent	4	7.3%	8.5%	5.6%		16.7%	6.3%	5.6%	8.3%	7.35
Mean Score			1.8510	2.0000				1.9074	1.8333	1.8537

$p_{(W/B)} = .5279$ (No SD) $p_{(Br)} = .9297$ (No SD)

Figure 8. Question 6b: To what extent were Army EO policies intended to help <u>Blacks</u>? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Not Applicable	1									
To A Little Extent	2	2.4%	3.2%			16.7%	0.9%	1.9%	4.0%	2.4%
To A Moderate Extent	3	15.2%	12.8%	31.6%	10.0%		17.0%	16.7%	28.0%	7.3%
To A Great Extent	4	82.4%	84.0%	68.4%	90.0%	83.3%	82.1%	81.5%	68.0%	90.2%
Mean Score			3.8085	3.6842				3.7963	3.6400	3.8780

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .2967 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .1306 (No SD)

Figure 9. Question 6c: To what extent were Army EO policies intended to help <u>Hispanics</u>? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	94	18	10	12	111	54	24	41
Not Applicable	1									
To A Little Extent	2	8.9%	10.6%	5.6%		16.7%	8.1%	5.6%	16.7%	9.8%
To A Moderate Extent	3	37.9%	40.4%	27.8%	30.0%	25.0%	39.6%	37.0%	45.8%	36.6%
To A Great Extent	4	53.2%	48.9%	66.7%	70.0%	58.3%	52.3%	57.5%	37.5%	53.7%
Mean Score			3.3830	3.6111				3.5185	3.2083	3.4390

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .1845 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .1572 (No SD)

Figure 10. Question 6d: To what extent were Army EO policies intended to help <u>other ethnic minorities</u>? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	94	18	10	12	111	54	24	41
Not Applicable	1	0.8%	1.1%				0.9%			2.4%
To A Little Extent	2	18.5%	21.3%	11.1%	10.0%	25.0%	18.0%	14.8%	25.0%	19.5%
To A Moderate Extent	3	42.7%	43.6%	38.9%	40.0%	33.3%	44.1%	42.6%	45.8%	43.9%
To A Great Extent	4	37.9%	34.0%	50.0%	50.0%	41.7%	36.9%	42.6%	29.2%	34.1%
Mean Score			3.1064	3.3889				3.2778	3.0417	3.0976

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .1503 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .3372 (No SD)

Figure 11. Question 6e: To what extent were Army EO policies intended to help <u>females</u>? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	94	18	10	12	111	54	24	41
Not Applicable	1									
To A Little Extent	2	9.7%	9.6%	5.6%	20.0%	25.0%	8.1%	9.3%	12.5%	7.3%
To A Moderate Extent	3	29.0%	30.9%	27.8%	20.0%	16.7%	30.6%	29.6%	33.3%	29.3%
To A Great Extent	4	61.3%	59.6%	66.7%	60.0%	58.3%	61.3%	61.1%	54.2%	63.4%
Mean Score			3.5000	3.6111					3.5185	3.4167	3.5610

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .5137 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .6988 (No SD)

Each of the groups were then asked to indicate which group had been helped the most by these equal opportunity policies.

Helped the most. By branch, there were no significant differences in perception when asked which racial or gender group had been helped most by Army equal opportunity policies (Figure 12-16). By race, Blacks and Whites exhibited only one significant difference in opinion. That difference occurred on the extent to which Blacks had been helped most. Not only did Whites perceive that Blacks had been helped 'to a great extent,' but Whites were also three times more likely than Blacks to say that Blacks had been helped 'to a great extent.' Blacks, the perceived primary beneficiaries of these policies, believed that they had been helped only 'to a moderate extent.' Moreover, Blacks tended to believe that women had been helped more than Blacks by equal opportunity. Just the opposite was true of White perceptions.

Thus, except for the issue of who had been helped most, Blacks or females, both Blacks and Whites were consistent in prioritizing the remaining groups. In priority order it followed the sequence of Hispanics, other minorities, and then Whites.

As mentioned earlier, by branch the differences were insignificant. That was only marginally so, however. On further review of the extent to which Blacks had been helped most, the combat support perceptions were just barely insignificantly different from the combat arms and combat service support perceptions. Whether this was due to more Blacks being in combat support was not investigated.

Figure 12. Question 7a: To what extent have <u>Whites</u> been helped most by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	18	10	12	110	54	23	41
Not Applicable	1	41.5%	44.1%	27.8%	40.0%	25.0%	42.7%	44.4%	43.5%	36.6%
To A Little Extent	2	42.3%	43.0%	50.0%	20.0%	33.3%	43.6%	38.9%	39.15	48.8%
To A Moderate Extent	3	12.2%	7.5%	22.25	40.0%	41.7%	9.1%	13.0%	17.4%	7.3%
To A Great Extent	4	4.1%	5.4%				4.5%	3.7%		7.3%
Mean Score			1.7419	1.9444				1.7593	1.7391	1.8537

$P_{(W/B)}$ = .3312 (No SD) $P_{(Br)}$ = .8148 (No SD)

Figure 13. Question 7b: To what extent have <u>Blacks</u> been helped most by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	19	10	12	111	54	24	41
Not Applicable	1	0.8%			10.0%		0.9%	1.9%		
To A Little Extent	2	4.9%	2.2%	21.1%			5.4%	5.6%	12.55	
To A Moderate Extent	3	35.0%	34.4%	57.9%		33.3%	35.1%	33.3%	45.8%	31.7%
To A Great Extent	4	59.3%	63.4%	21.1%	90.0%	66.7%	58.6%	59.3%	41.7%	68.3%
Mean Score			3.6129	3.0000				3.5000	3.2917	3.6829

$P_{(W/B)}$ = **.0000** (SD) $P_{(Br)}$ = .0526 (No SD)

Figure 14. Question 7c: To what extent have <u>Hispanics</u> been helped most by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	18	10	12	110	54	23	41
Not Applicable	1	0.8%			10.0%		0.9%	1.9%		
To A Little Extent	2	17.9%	16.1%	27.8%			19.1%	14.8%	26.1%	14.6%
To A Moderate Extent	3	46.3%	49.5%	50.0%	20.0%	50.0%	46.4%	48.1%	39.1%	48.8%
To A Great Extent	4	35.0%	34.4%	22.2%	70.0%	50.0%	33.6%	35.2%	34.8%	36.6%
Mean Score			3.1828	2.9444					3.1667	3.0870	3.2195

p(W/B) = .1865 (No SD) p(Br) = .7874 (No SD)

Figure 15. Question 7d: To what extent have <u>other ethnic minorities</u> been helped most by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		122	92	18	10	12	109	53	23	41
Not Applicable	1	1.6%	1.1%		10.0%		1.8%	1.9%	4.3%	
To A Little Extent	2	27.9%	27.2%	38.9%		16.7%	28.45	32.1%	21.7%	24.4%
To A Moderate Extent	3	44.3%	46.7%	38.9%	40.0%	58.3%	43.1%	41.5%	43.5%	46.3%
To A Great Extent	4	26.2%	25.0%	22.2%	50.0%	25.0%	26.6%	24.55	30.4%	29.3%
Mean Score			2.9565	2.8333					2.8868	3.0000	3.0488

p(W/B) = .5306 (No SD) p(Br) = .6005 (No SD)

Figure 16. Question 7e: To what extent have <u>females</u> been helped most by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	18	10	12	110	54	23	41
Not Applicable	1	0.8%			10.0%		0.9%	1.9%		
To A Little Extent	2	7.3%	6.5%	16.7%		8.3%	7.3%	9.3%	8.7%	4.9%
To A Moderate Extent	3	43.9%	47.3%	50.0%	10.0%	66.7%	41.8%	44.4%	43.5%	43.9%
To A Great Extent	4	48.0%	46.2%	33.3%	80.0%	25.05	50.0%	44.4%	47.8%	51.2%
Mean Score			3.3978	3.1667					3.3148	3.3913	3.4634

p(W/B) = .1547 (No SD) P(Br) = .5617 (No SD)

21

As the fact that which group is at the bottom of the 'perceived to have been helped most' list is not necessarily reflective who has been helped least, that became the focus of the next question.

Helped the least. The question, "To what extent has each of the following groups been helped least by Army EO policies?" and possible responses of 'to a little extent,' 'to a moderate extent,' and 'to a great extent' caused more confusion than intended. Many respondents indicated that the 'double negative' situation invalidated this question. This may partially explain why over 10% of the students who answered the other questions did not respond to this one question (Figures 17-21).

Based on the responses of those who did answer the question, however, two significant differences in race perception exist -- none were evident from a branch perspective. Although Blacks and Whites agreed that Whites had been helped least, they differed in their characterization of the extent of 'helped least.' Blacks tend to believe that Whites had been helped least 'to a little extent.' Whites tend to believe that they had been helped least 'to a moderate extent.'

The second instance of significant difference occurred in the characterization of how much Blacks had been helped least. Whites believed that Blacks had been helped least 'to a little extent.' Blacks thought that they had been helped least 'to a moderate extent.'

The inference in both of these cases is that each group thought that they had not been helped as much as the other group thought they had been helped. However, neither of

these perceptions should be construed to mean that who has been helped least has been

'hurt' by Army equal opportunity policies.

Figure 17. Question 8a: To what extent have <u>Whites</u> been helped least by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		116	86	18	10	12	105	52	21	38
Not Applicable	*1*	19.8%	17.4%	27.8%	30.0%	30.0%	19.0%	26.9%	9.5%	13.2%
To A Little Extent	*2*	12.9%	10.5%	22.2%	20.0%		14.3%	15.4%	19.0%	7.9%
To A Moderate Extent	*3*	21.6%	19.8%	27.8%	20.0%	50.0%	19.0%	17.3%	28.6%	23.7%
To A Great Extent	*4*	45.7%	52.3%	22.2%	30.0%	20.0%	47.6%	40.4%	42.9%	55.3%
Mean Score			*3.0698*	*2.4444*					*2.7115*	*3.0476*	*3.2105*

$p_{(W/B)} = .0392$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .1213$ (No SD)

Figure 18. Question 8b: To what extent have <u>Blacks</u> been helped least by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		110	82	19	10	9	100	50	19	37
Not Applicable	*1*	30.9%	31.7%	15.8%	57.1%	22.2%	32.0%	32.0%	42.1%	21.6%
To A Little Extent	*2*	50.9%	54.9%	36.8%	42.9%	66.7%	49.0%	50.0%	42.1%	56.8%
To A Moderate Extent	*3*	15.5%	11.0%	42.1%		11.1%	16.0%	14.0%	15.8%	18.9%
To A Great Extent	*4*	2.7%	2.4%	5.3%			3.0%	4.0%		2.7%
Mean Score			*1.8415*	*2.3684*					*1.9000*	*1.7368*	*2.0270*

$p_{(W/B)} = .0058$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .3943$ (No SD)

Figure 19. Question 8c: To what extent have <u>Hispanics</u> been helped least by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		111	84	18	10	10	100	50	19	38
Not Applicable	1	24.3%	23.8%	16.7%	57.1%	20.0%	25.0%	28.0%	31.6%	15.8%
To A Little Extent	2	42.3%	46.4%	33.3%	28.6%	50.0%	42.0%	42.0%	42.1%	47.4%
To A Moderate Extent	3	28.8%	26.2%	44.4%	14.3%	30.0%	29.0%	26.0%	26.3%	31.6%
To A Great Extent	4	4.5%	3.6%	5.6%			4.0%	4.0%		5.3%
Mean Score			2.0952	2.3889				2.0600	1.9474	2.2632

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .1656 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .3231 (No SD)

Figure 20. Question 8d: To what extent have <u>other ethnic minorities</u> been helped least by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		110	84	18	10	10	99	50	19	38
Not Applicable	1	22.7%	22.6%	16.7%	42.9%	20.0%	23.2%	22.0%	31.6%	18.4%
To A Little Extent	2	42.7%	47.6%	33.3%	14.3%	50.0%	42.4%	46.0%	36.8%	44.7%
To A Moderate Extent	3	24.5%	19.0%	44.4%	42.9%	10.0%	26.3%	24.0%	26.3%	23.7%
To A Great Extent	4	10.0%	10.7%	5.6%		20.0%	8.1%	8.0%	5.3%	13.2%
Mean Score			2.1786	2.3889				2.1800	2.0526	2.3158

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .3692 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .5631 (No SD)

Figure 21. Question 8e: To what extent have <u>females</u> been helped least by Army EO policies? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		109	82	18	10	8	100	51	18	36
Not Applicable	1	28.4%	28.0%	16.7%	57.1%	25.0%	29.0%	29.4%	38.9%	19.4%
To A Little Extent	2	49.5%	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%	50.0%	49.0%	45.1%	50.0%	55.6%
To A Moderate Extent	3	18.3%	17.1%	33.3%		12.5%	19.0%	23.5%	11.1%	16.7%
To A Great Extent	4	3.7%	4.9%			12.5%	3.0%	2.0%		8.3%
Mean Score			1.9878	2.1667				1.9804	1.7222	2.1389

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .3878 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .1883 (No SD)

24

Overall, these results indicate that the Army's equal opportunity and treatment policies have been successful. They also indicate that Blacks and females have been helped most as a result of these policies, and that Whites have been helped the least. There were major differences, however, in Black and White perceptions of the extent of this help. By branch perceptions, these distinctions were insignificant.

Regardless of the perception either of the racial or branch groups had toward the Army's equal opportunity policies, each was then asked to provide their opinion on several possible strategies for monitoring and assuring racial and gender diversity within the Army.

Possible equal opportunity and treatment implementation strategies.

Through responses on four questions, respondents were queried on equal opportunity indicators, as well as minority and female representation throughout the Army. There were significant differences in perceptions between Blacks and Whites on all four questions. The branch views were not significantly different from those of Whites.

EOT indicators. The issue presented was whether minority and female selection rates from promotion and school selection boards should be used as indicators of equal opportunity (Figure 22). Whites were almost evenly split between disagreeing and agreeing with this concept statement. Thus, their overall response may be characterized as neutral. On the other hand, the overall Black response was 'agree.' More telling is that 53% of Blacks 'strongly agreed' with this concept, as compared to only 3% of Whites.

A possible cause of this significant difference in attitude may lie in the fact that Blacks do not think they have been protected by equal opportunity to the extent that they

should have been. To them, emphasis on this indicator is one method to ensure the focus

on equal opportunity remains in tack. The White position is likely split because of

images of reverse discrimination and the perception that for whatever reasons, Blacks still

did not seem to enjoy the same degree of success that Whites do.

Figure 22. Question 9: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "The Army should use minority and female promotion and school selection rates as indicators of equal opportunity"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		124	93	19	10	12	111	53	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	21.0%	23.7%		20.0%	16.7%	20.7%	24.5%	20.0%	12.2%
Disagree	2	21.0%	21.5%	15.8%	30.0%	25.0%	20.7%	18.9%	12.0%	31.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	7.3%	6.5%	10.5%	10.0%		8.1%	3.8%	20.0%	4.9%
Agree	4	40.3%	45.2%	21.1%	40.0%	58.3%	38.7%	43.4%	40.0%	36.6%
Strongly Agree	5	10.5%	3.2%	52.6%			11.7%	9.4%	8.0%	14.6%
Mean Score			2.8280	4.1053					2.9434	3.0400	3.0976

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0001 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .8599 (No SD)

The question on EO indicators was followed by respondent attitudes toward the idea

of preferential treatment for or against minorities and females.

Preferential Treatment. Two scenarios were presented to highlight the respondent's

attitude toward preferential treatment: one in which minorities and females were under-

represented in a rank and/or career field, and another in which minorities and females

were over-represented. No significant differences were evident by branch perception.

Each indicated that preferential treatment should not be considered. That was not the

case when viewed from a race perspective, however. By race, the differences were

significant.

Whites 'disagreed' with giving preferential treatment to minorities and females when they were *under-represented* in career fields or promotion grades (Figure 23). It did not seem to matter whether the minorities and females met all the qualifications for the position. As there are likely a limited number of such positions and promotions available, Whites might perceive themselves to be the ones to 'lose' if this concept is vigorously implemented. The 'White' solution to this dilemma is to aggressively recruit and train all soldiers at the entry level, and then to 'trust the system to be fair' thereafter.

Blacks tended to 'neither agree not disagree,' or in other words, to be neutral. Since Blacks seemingly do not yet trust the system or the leadership to the extent that Whites do, they apparently do not favor or disapprove outright the concept of preferential treatment.

Figure 23. Question 10: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "If minorities and females are under-represented in a rank and/or career field, the Army should give preferential treatment in promoting and selecting those minorities and females? (Assume they are fully qualified, but not as qualified as others being considered.)" (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions.)

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		122	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	43.2%	50.0%	5.3%	40.0%	50.0%	42.0%	38.9%	48.0%	41.5%
Disagree	2	33.6%	34.0%	21.1%	60.0%	25.0%	34.8%	37.0%	32.0%	34.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	8.0%	5.3%	26.3%			8.9%	7.4%	12.0%	7.3%
Agree	4	12.8%	10.6%	31.6%		25.0%	11.6%	11.1%	8.0%	17.1%
Strongly Agree	5	2.4%		15.8%			2.7%	5.6%		
Mean Score			1.7660	3.3158				2.0741	1.8000	2.0000

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0000 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .5976 (No SD)

When minorities and females are *over-represented* in promotion and/or career fields, Blacks again tended to be somewhat neutral (Figure 24). In this case the Black viewpoint

is likely rooted in the perception that Blacks would 'lose the little ground' they had painstakingly gained under Army equal opportunity policies. As before, Whites tended to oppose any form of official 'discrimination,' even if it meant they would probably gain in the process.

Figure 24. Question 11: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "If minorities and females are over-represented in a rank and/or career field, the Army should give preferential treatment in promoting and selecting <u>non-minority males</u>? (Assume they are fully qualified, but not as qualified as the minorities and females being considered.)" (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions.)

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		*125*	*94*	*19*	*10*	*12*	*112*	*54*	*25*	*41*
Strongly Disagree	*1*	44.4%	52.1%	10.5%	30.0%	41.7%	44.6%	42.6%	48.0%	41.5%
Disagree	*2*	35.2%	31.9%	36.8%	70.0%	25.0%	36.6%	38.9%	36.0%	34.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	*3*	8.0%	5.3%	26.3%		8.3%	8.0%	5.6%	8.0%	12.2%
Agree	*4*	12.0%	10.6%	26.3%		25.0%	10.7%	13.0%	8.0%	12.2%
Strongly Agree	*5*									
Mean Score			*1.7447*	*2.6842*				*1.8888*	*1.7600*	*1.9512*

$p_{(W/B)} = .0002$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .7500$ (No SD)

This section on strategies for implementing equal opportunity wraps up with respondent attitudes toward the controlling the racial composition of the Army leadership.

<u>Racial composition of Army leadership</u>. The issue of the racial composition of the Army leadership proved to be another contentious and divisive issue (Figure 25). Whites tended to believe that the Army should not be concerned with or try to control the racial mix of its leadership. They felt that the racial composition of the active Army nor of the United States should not be a governing factor. Blacks, probably recognizing that they have had so few leaders in those positions, yet so many in the lower ranks, tended to

believe that the leadership should be representative of the racial composition of the active Army.

Although the perceptions by branch were not significantly different, the responses were slightly divisive. The combat arms respondents were more likely to respond that the Army should not be concerned with its racial composition. The combat support and combat service support respondents were more likely to indicated that the racial composition of the Army should be representative of the active Army.

Figure 25. Question 12: What should be the appropriate racial composition (population) of the active Army leadership (officers and NCOs)? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		122	92	19	10	12	109	51	25	41
Representative of U.S.	1	18.9%	18.5%	21.1%	22.2%	25.0%	18.3%	19.6%	20.0%	17.1%
Representative of Active Army	2	26.2%	20.7%	57.9%	11.1%	41.7%	24.8%	17.6%	28.0%	36.6%
Army Not Concerned	3	33.6%	39.1%	10.5%	33.3%	16.7%	35.8%	35.3%	40.0%	29.3%
Other	4	21.3%	21.7%	10.5%	33.3%	16.7%	21.1%	27.5%	12.0%	17.1%
Mean Score			2.6413	2.1053				2.7059	2.4400	2.4634

$P_{(W/B)}$ = .0356 (SD) $P_{(Br)}$ = .4196 (No SD)

The concept of racial composition of the Army leadership was one of two issues in the survey which received the most written comments. The following are representative of the numerous comments submitted by the respondents:

"The Army should promote the most qualified. If minorities are under represented, focus should be on recruitment/accessions and military training." [Survey 4]

"Army policy should be to promote/school the best and not worry about numbers." [Survey 12]

"Racism works both ways. Minority groups find nothing wrong with gaining advantage at the expense of individuals more qualified and more skilled." [Survey 23]

"I believe that quotas and set-asides[21] are wrong. They will not solve the problem. In fact, they will exacerbate the problem. They only serve to engender anger among racial groups that do not benefit from quotas and set-asides." [Survey 27]

"U.S. Army promotion boards do a superlative job of ensuring fairness and equitable selection of best qualified officers. As a 'board veteran' I was extremely impressed with formal board procedures to ensure fairness." [Survey 29]

"(Promoting/selecting minorities and females who are under-represented) should be done less in the senior levels. Must be done in junior levels to ensure level play(ing) field (later on)." [Survey 37]

"When we start bypassing the best to promote equality, e.g., through promotions and command selection, we do our Army and our soldiers a disservice. We often also set up those minority groups for potential failures. Personally, I'm getting tired of seeing the minority selections for BZ (Below-the-zone) promotions and command. Understand the principle, but it's wrong." [Survey 68]

"I've felt I had to be twice as good to be viewed as ½ as competent. No one was surprised if a woman failed and everyone was surprised if we did well. While in battalion command, my 1-star gave me crap because I was too forceful. Whereas he would never have said that to a man. A man is aggressive and a woman is a bitch." [Survey 79]

"Slates for key jobs in OSD, JCS, White House, Pentagon, PERSCOM. Not a perception. A lot of gender picking and minority picking." [Survey 103]

Degree of racial and gender discrimination.

The last issue to be addressed concerning Army equal opportunity and treatment policies was the extent of racial and gender discrimination in the Army. The intent was to obtain perceptions on whether the respondents believed they have been discriminated against. As the issue was discrimination, no attempt was made to further divide it into racial or gender discrimination.

Despite the Army's long standing equal opportunity and treatment policies, over 75% of Blacks believed that they have been discriminated[22] against in the Army. More importantly, 31% believed they have been discriminated against within the last 5 years. Interesting as well is that over 25% of Whites believed that they too had been discriminated against in their Army career -- 20% say so in the last 5 years. No investigation was conducted to determine whether the White perceptions of discrimination were largely due to discrimination against White women (as opposed to presumably reverse discrimination).

Despite earlier apprehensions in specifically addressing female perceptions (due to insufficient data), the author feels it necessary to do so here. The data indicated that over 50% of the women believed that they had been discriminated against in the Army. Eighteen percent believed that had been discriminated against in the last 5 years. As all the female responses were from White women, presumably this discrimination was due to gender discrimination, not racial discrimination.

The data also tends to indicate that incidents of race discrimination have increased somewhat over the years. The likely case, however, is that recent incidents of race discrimination are much more vivid than incidents which happened 10 to 15 years ago.

Figure 26. Question 13: Have you been discriminated against because of race or gender (assignments, evaluations, awards, schooling, promotions, etc)? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents	*119*	*89*	*19*	*10*	*11*	*107*	*51*	*24*	*39*
Yes	37.5%	27.8%	78.9%	33.3%	54.5%	35.2%	34.6%	37.5%	38.5%
Yes, in last 5 Years	21.0%	20.2%	31.6%		18.2%	20.6%	23.5%	20.8%	15.4%
Yes, 6-10 Years Ago	12.6%	6.7%	36.8%		9.1%	12.1%	13.7%	4.2%	12.8%
Yes, 11-15 Years Ago	10.9%	6.7%	31.6%	11.1%	36.4%	8.4%	13.7%	4.2%	12.8%
Yes, 16+ Years Ago	11.8%	7.9%	21.1%	22.2%	36.4%	9.3%	11.8%	16.7%	7.7%

$p_{(W/B)}$ = Not Applicable $p_{(Br)}$ = N/A

Over the last 50 years, the Army has developed comprehensive equal opportunity and treatment policies. These policies appear to be well understood by the senior leaders in this War College class. When asked to characterize the success of those policies, however, this class exhibits significant racial differences in perception. Whites tend to have a much more positive or optimistic attitude toward the outcome of these policies than Blacks. Blacks are much more cautious in their characterization of the success of these policies. As Whites are much more optimistic about past outcomes of these policies, they tend to not favor preferential treatment for minorities and females when these groups are under-represented in the Army. In stark contrast Blacks responded more neutral. In either case both Blacks and Whites indicated significant amounts of past discrimination -- over a 20 year career and within the last 5 years.

Selected Diversity Issues

A number of diversity issues were included in the survey for respondent feedback. These diversity issues included perceptions on mentorship and professional development,

sexual harassment, women and combat, minorities and female sensitivity, Confederate

flag related issues, and homosexuals and the military. These issues were selected because

the author perceived them to be "hot" issues in the Army today.

Mentorship and professional development.

Two questions formed the basis for perceptions on mentoring and professional

development. The first question involved perceptions on the effectiveness of mentoring

of each racial group, plus females -- thus five questions in one. The other question

involved perceptions on minority participation in minority-based professional

development organizations. Responses to these six questions resulted in significant

differences in perception between Blacks and Whites on each. By branch, the differences

were not significant; they were consistent with White responses.

Mentoring. Given previous responses, not surprisingly, White and Black responses

were significantly different when asked which group was more effectively mentored[23]

(Figure 27-31). Whites thought Blacks were more effectively mentored than any of the

other groups. Using the means of the White responses as the indicator of who was more

effectively mentored, Whites thought Blacks received the most effective mentoring,

followed by women, Whites, Hispanics, and then other minorities. Using the means of the

Black responses, the order is Whites, females, other minorities, Hispanics, and then

Blacks.

Figure 27. Question 14a: How effectively are <u>Whites</u> mentored? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		120	92	19	10	12	107	50	24	41
Very Ineffective	1	3.3%	2.2%	5.3%	14.3%		3.7%	4.0%	4.2%	2.4%
Ineffective	2	15.0%	18.5%	5.3%			16.8%	20.0%	8.3%	12.2%
Neutral	3	22.5%	28.3%		14.3%	33.3%	21.5%	18.0%	29.2%	24.4%
Effective	4	46.7%	44.6%	47.4%	71.4%	50.0%	45.8%	44.0%	41.7%	53.7%
Very Effective	5	12.5%	6.5%	42.1%		16.7%	12.1%	14.0%	16.7%	7.3%
Mean Score			3.3478	4.1579				3.4400	3.5833	3.5122

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0011 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .8425 (No SD)

Figure 28. Question 14b: How effectively are <u>Blacks</u> mentored? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		120	92	19	10	12	107	50	24	41
Very Ineffective	1	7.5%	2.2%	31.6%	14.3%		8.4%	12.0%	4.2%	4.9%
Ineffective	2	16.7%	12.0%	36.8%	14.3%	8.3%	17.8%	18.0%	16.7%	14.6%
Neutral	3	21.7%	22.8%	21.1%	14.3%	33.3%	20.6%	20.0%	25.0%	22.0%
Effective	4	40.8%	48.9%	5.3%	28.6%	50.0%	39.3%	38.0%	41.7%	41.5%
Very Effective	5	13.3%	14.1%	5.3%	28.6%	8.3%	14.0%	12.0%	12.5%	17.1%
Mean Score			3.6087	2.1579				3.2000	3.4167	3.5122

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0000 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .4210 (No SD)

Figure 29. Question 14c: How effectively are <u>Hispanics</u> mentored? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		117	89	19	10	12	104	48	24	40
Very Ineffective	1	7.7%	3.4%	26.3%	14.3%	8.3%	7.7%	8.3%	8.3%	7.5%
Ineffective	2	17.9%	15.7%	26.3%	14.3%	25.0%	17.3%	22.9%	16.7%	12.5%
Neutral	3	38.5%	39.3%	36.8%	28.6%	33.3%	38.5%	33.3%	33.3%	42.5%
Effective	4	30.8%	34.8%	10.5%	42.9%	33.3%	30.8%	29.2%	41.7%	30.0%
Very Effective	5	5.1%	6.7%				5.8%	6.3%		7.5%
Mean Score			3.2584	2.3158				3.0208	3.0833	3.1750

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0001 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .7815 (No SD)

34

Figure 30. Question 14d: How effectively are <u>other ethnic minorities</u> mentored? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		118	90	19	10	12	105	48	24	41
Very Ineffective	1	9.3%	3.3%	31.6%	28.6%	8.3%	9.5%	10.4%	12.5%	7.3%
Ineffective	2	16.9%	15.6%	15.8%	28.6%	16.7%	17.1%	18.8%	16.7%	14.6%
Neutral	3	41.5%	42.2%	42.1%	28.6%	41.7%	41.0%	37.5%	37.5%	43.9%
Effective	4	27.1%	33.3%	5.3%	14.3%	33.3%	26.7%	27.1%	33.3%	26.8%
Very Effective	5	5.1%	5.6%	5.3%			5.7%	6.3%		7.3%
Mean Score			3.2222	2.3684				3.0000	2.9167	3.1220

$P_{(W/B)} = .0005$ (SD) $P_{(Br)} = .7238$ (No SD)

Figure 31. Question 14e: How effectively are <u>females</u> mentored? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		118	90	19	10	12	105	48	24	41
Very Ineffective	1	6.8%	4.4%	15.8%	14.3%	8.3%	6.7%	8.3%	4.2%	7.3%
Ineffective	2	23.7%	18.9%	47.4%	28.6%	41.7%	21.9%	33.3%	16.7%	17.1%
Neutral	3	23.7%	25.6%	21.1%	14.3%	25.0%	23.8%	20.8%	29.2%	24.4%
Effective	4	31.4%	36.7%	5.3%	28.6%	25.0%	32.4%	25.0%	41.7%	34.1%
Very Effective	5	14.4%	14.4%	10.5%	14.3%		15.2%	12.5%	8.3%	17.1%
Mean Score			3.3778	2.4737				3.0000	3.3333	3.3659

$P_{(W/B)} = .0015$ (SD) $P_{(Br)} = .2765$ (No SD)

In terms of written comments on mentoring the following are representative:

"I didn't like your approach to mentorship. In the CSS (combat service support) field I work with a good number of female officers as well as male (black and white). To me mentorship implies mentoring all officers and selecting the very best to follow up on over the long run. As such, I have several officers whose careers I have taken an interest in. The breakout includes three white males, two females, and two black males. In all honesty I hadn't considered the race/female issue. In mentoring I looked for the top officers who I would want to work with me again." [Survey 28]

"Networking, mentoring, and support groups are very important." [Survey 34]

"Mentored by who? I do not believe people have to be mentored by someone of their own race." [Survey 49]

"Very good survey. I was most interested in the mentorship piece. Senior black officers seem to be afraid to offer their mentorship to young black officers. I wish your survey and other Army surveys could determine why this apprehension exist." [Survey 50]

"I think mentoring is the key to all minority officers, to include women. Minority officers don't get enough of this and never will unless white officers join in this effort." [Survey 51]

"Mentoring of today's officers is broken! Regardless of race or gender." [Survey 60]

"Mentoring is a problem for all groups, not just minorities." [Survey 66]

"I think it's a lost art." [Survey 77]

"Individuals are mentored, not groups. There is no way anyone could answer this question accurately." [Survey 88]

Obviously, based on the written comments alone, this issue is quite argumentative. As indicated by the respondents, what constitutes mentoring is subject to interpretation.

Since minorities and women often participate in minority- or female-based professional development organizations for mentoring, that issue formed the basis for the next question.

Professional development. Blacks were overwhelming 'very positive' in their outlook on minorities participating in minority-based professional development organizations (Figure 32). They were six times as likely to indicate such a response as were Whites, whose overall response tended to be 'neutral.' Likewise, the response by branch also tended to be somewhat 'neutral.'

36

Figure 32. Question 15: **Minority officers often participate in formal and informal minority-based organizations geared toward their professional development. How do you view minority officers' participation in such organizations?** (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Very Negative	1	6.4%	8.5%				7.1%	7.4%		9.8%
Negative	2	12.0%	14.9%		10.0%	8.3%	12.5%	7.4%	24.0%	12.2%
Neutral	3	33.6%	36.2%		60.0%	41.7%	32.1%	33.3%	40.0%	29.3%
Positive	4	28.8%	29.8%	31.6%	20.0%	25.0%	29.5%	35.2%	24.0%	26.8%
Very Positive	5	19.2%	10.6%	68.4%	10.0%	25.0%	18.8%	16.7%	12.0%	22.0%
Mean Score			3.1915	4.6842				3.4630	3.2400	3.3902

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0000 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .7150 (No SD)

Written comments were other than neutral, however:

"The Army's senior leadership continues to tolerate official and unofficial organizations for the promotion of professional development of minority officers. Although they are quiet about it, the majority of white officers resent and mistrust such organizations. For this reason alone, such organizations should be discouraged. Any organization purporting to promote the professional development of solely white officers would absolutely not be tolerated. Many officers ask, Why the apparent double standard here? Unofficial gender-based organizations have now permeated the Army to such a degree that they are almost institutionalized around senior female officers, much the same way black officers formed organizations in years past. For a number of reasons, however, these gender-based organizations are thought by some to be even more powerful and more pervasive (than) those of their minority-based, male counterparts." [Survey 8]

"Believe 'minority-based' organizations as well as 'majority-based' organizations promote exclusion of other members because of race, color, creed, etc. All are offensive to me and should not be permitted for Army officer's participation." [Survey 15]

"Any organization that discriminates on the basis of race and/or gender tends to polarize the organization, the military, and society as a whole. We need inclusion, not exclusion. We should not allow organizations that use race/gender as a prerequisite to membership." [Survey 38]

"Question: How do your soldiers, specifically minority soldiers, think about this? I believe in a school or academic assignment, it is OK, but in a TOE unit, the perceptions of these organizations could be different. Could be seen as a minority 'click' by the soldiers." [Survey 49]

"Mixed emotions. I find it odd that minorities, especially blacks, can belong to totally Black organizations focused on their advancement, openly stated, but the same is not allowed for whites. If whites do it, it's racist. As an American Indian, I find it odd this is not raised as an issue." [Survey 54]

"(Very negatively look upon) only those (organizations) that swear a secret oath that is stronger than their oath of office and which violate chain of command/fraternization intent/rules." [Survey 92]

Sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment[24] covered issues related to reducing sexual harassment and whether the respondents had personally experienced sexual harassment . The first question dealt with how to reduce sexual harassment. Three 'solutions' were presented and the respondents were asked how effective each would be in resolving this issue. In each case there were no significant differences in responses by race or by branch. The question on personal experience with sexual harassment was not appropriate for determining significant difference.

Sexual harassment solutions. Most respondents believed that appropriate punishment under the military's judicial system would be 'very effective' in combating sexual harassment (Figure 33). They too strongly favored assigning more female drill sergeants to training units (Figure 34). Additionally, each group felt that greater emphasis on 'respect and consideration training'[25] would be 'effective' in reducing sexual harassment (Figure 35). When comparing the means of each of these alternatives, the priority seemed to descend from (1) exercise the military judicial system, (2) to

implementing respect and consideration training, and (3) then to assigning more female

drill sergeants to training units.

Figure 33. Question 16a: There have been a number of sexual harassment incidents involving male drill sergeants and female trainees. How effective is the <u>military judicial system</u> in significantly decreasing the possibility of this happening again? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Very Ineffective	1	1.6%	1.1%	5.3%			1.8%	1.9%		2.4%
Ineffective	2	0.8%	1.1%				0.9%		4.0%	
Neutral	3	3.2%	2.1%	5.3%	10.0%		3.6%	3.7%		4.9%
Effective	4	41.6%	42.6%	47.4%	30.0%	33.3%	42.9%	44.4%	60.0%	29.3%
Very Effective	5	52.8%	53.2%	42.1%	60.0%	66.7%	50.9%	50.0%	36.0%	63.4%
Mean Score			4.4574	4.2105				4.4074	4.2800	4.5122

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .1935 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .4765 (No SD)

Figure 34. Question 16b: There have been a number of sexual harassment incidents involving male drill sergeants and female trainees. How effective would <u>assigning more female drill sergeants to training units</u> be in significantly decreasing the possibility of this happening again? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	92	19	10	12	110	52	25	41
Very Ineffective	1	2.4%	2.2%	5.3%			2.7%	3.8%		2.4%
Ineffective	2	7.3%	7.6%	5.3%	10.0%	8.3%	7.3%	7.7%	12.0%	4.9%
Neutral	3	26.8%	27.2%	15.8%	40.0%	16.7%	27.3%	15.4%	40.0%	29.3%
Effective	4	47.2%	46.7%	52.6%	40.0%	33.4%	49.1%	57.7%	40.0%	39.0%
Very Effective	5	16.3%	16.3%	21.1%	10.0%	41.7%	13.6%	15.4%	8.0%	24.4%
Mean Score			3.6739	3.7895				3.7308	3.4400	3.7805

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .6249 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .3212 (No SD)

Figure 35. Question 16c: There have been a number of sexual harassment incidents involving male drill sergeants and female trainees. How effective would <u>respect & consideration training</u> be in significantly decreasing the possibility of this happening again? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Very Ineffective	1	1.6%	1.1%	5.3%			1.8%	1.9%		2.4%
Ineffective	2	6.4%	8.5%				7.1%	7.4%	4.0%	7.3%
Neutral	3	16.8%	17.0%	15.8%	10.0%	8.3%	17.9%	24.1%	12.0%	7.3%
Effective	4	40.8%	40.4%	31.6%	60.0%	25.0%	42.0%	33.3%	64.0%	34.1%
Very Effective	5	34.4%	33.0%	47.4%	30.0%	66.7%	31.3%	33.3%	20.0%	48.8%
Mean Score			3.9574	4.1579				3.8889	4.0000	4.1951

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .4216 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .3142 (No SD)

A significant number of respondents offered other possible solutions. Most prominent among these other solutions is establishment of separate male and female training units. The below comments are representative:

"Unless we change the training environment more substantially, we can anticipate further cases such as the ones at Aberdeen." [Survey 13]

"I would think training units with females only or high percentages of females would have a higher percentage of female drill (sergeants)." [Survey 17]

"In depth review of locations where these behaviors have not occurred. Analysis of differences. Shake up and replacement of senior NCOs (CSMs) -- where NCO behavior is questionable. Revamp or elimination of EO offices -- completely ineffective. Look at IG, JAG, MP awareness of command climate. Eliminate institutional and traditional blocks to commanders awareness." [Survey 19]

"Education, supervision, leader involvement... I have found that leader involvement, translate commitment, can change things. That especially includes NCO leaders. We need to nail violators to the cross on equal opportunity issues at all grade levels. We cannot protect senior leader, officers and NCOs, screw ups and attitudes and continue to prosecute with vigor the small, young violators who can learn and change. That's our problem on all things. You can't retire a retirement eligible zipper problem, harasser or poor leader. You need to crush them. It's not happening." [Survey 33]

"(To reduce the sexual harassment problem, the Army should establish a class for) female recruits making it clear the Army does not tolerate sexual harassment or support those who practice it. They need to know they not only can say no -- the Army wants them to say no and report it. Also need to tell them avenues to use to report it. Still problem with dirty jokes and pictures, calendar. Comments about my legs by my boss, etc. Nothing more than embarrassing comments and over friendly overtures -- thank goodness." [Survey 34]

"Enforcement of existing regulations by entire chain of command." [Survey 39]

"Hold senior leaders more accountable." [Survey 56]

"(Assign more female drill sergeants in) equal numbers according to population." [Survey 60]

"Segregate men and women in basic training; require all leaders prior to assuming command of basic trainees and AIT soldiers to undergo refresher training to include a written test that measures their ability to understand EO and sexual harassment presentation concepts." [Survey 69]

"Speaking from experience, battalion commander -- training unit, if you have female Drill Sergeants to train/mentor female soldiers, I will guarantee almost 0% sexual harassment." [Survey 77]

"Punish female recruits who pursue D.I.s" [Survey 93]

"(To eliminate or reduce sexual harassment in initial training units, believe we need to) separate male and female basic training. Put AIT together. We are fooling ourselves if we believe that integrated, male/female, basic training is the best course of action. For too long the Army has hidden its head in the sand with respect to the physical differences between men and women. Additionally, we have unleashed a monster with the 1-800 complaint business which has degenerated into 'telephone terror' against devoted soldiers who unfortunately have a female in their past with an ax to grind." [Survey 94]

"Separate basic training environment." [Survey 106]

"When the command climate is zero tolerance, you will have little harassment. Can't just pay lip service and look the other way." [Survey 123]

In wrapping up the issue of sexual harassment, the respondents were asked whether they have ever been sexually harassed.

Personal experiences in being sexually harassed. Approximately 16% of all respondents indicate they had been personally sexually harassed in the Army (Figure 36). Although the female population was small, and thus suspect for offering statistically valid conclusions, 75% of women (military and civilian) say they have been sexually harassed. More surprisingly, 33% of women say 'yes' to sexual harassment in the last 5 years. For military females, these latter instances of sexual harassment occurred at a time in their careers when they were already senior field grade officers.

From a branch perspective, combat support personnel appear to have been sexually harassed the least. As this 'yes/no' question is not suitable for analysis of variance, whether this difference is significant or not was not determined.

As sexual harassment works both ways, note that 10% of males indicate that they too have been sexually harassed. Even more surprising is that more men 'reported' incidents of sexual harassment within the last 5 years than at any time in their past. Additionally, combat arms respondents indicated more sexual harassment than either of the other two branches, which is surprising considering women are not permitted to serve in most of the combat arms positions.

Figure 36. Question 17: Have you been sexually harassed? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents	*123*	*92*	*19*	*10*	*12*	*110*	*52*	*25*	*41*
Yes	16.3%	18.5%	15.8%	0.0%	75.0%	10.0%	17.3%	8.0%	17.1%
Yes, in last 5 Years	8.9%	8.7%	15.8%		33.3%	6.4%	15.4%		7.3%
Yes, 6-10 Years Ago	3.3%	4.3%			25.0%	0.9%	1.9%		4.9%
Yes, 11-15 Years Ago	7.3%	8.7%	5.3%		58.3%	1.8%	1.9%	4.0%	12.2%
Yes, 16+ Years Ago	5.7%	7.6%			41.7%	1.8%	3.8%	4.0%	7.3%

$p_{(W/B)}$ = Not Applicable $p_{(Br)}$ = N/A

Written comments on sexual harassment include the following:

"(I have been harassed) if you go by strict definition, but the definition is too strict, and I never took offense, at all!" [Survey 63]

"There was a couple of times I wanted to be!" [Survey 68]

"Gender issues are somewhat different. They include not only gender discrimination, but also sexual assault, sexual harassment, and gender-based harassment that is not 'sexual' per se. While sexual harassment and assault are targeted more toward the younger/lower ranking women (both officer and enlisted), gender discrimination and gender-based harassment is just as prevalent, if not worse, at the senior ranks. Army leadership gives tacit approval by failure to take disciplinary action; scape goating the women who complain; continuing to refer to them as 'girls' and other demeaning names; ignoring and joking about wife/woman abuse; and valuing only male attributes/strengths and belittling female strengths." [Survey 89]

Although there was no preconceived notion on a relationship between sexual harassment and women in combat arms specialties, that was the next issue examined.

Women and combat.

The women and combat question involved whether women should be allowed to serve in all combat arms specialties and whether they will ever achieve equality without that right. In addition to significant differences of perception between Blacks and Whites on each of the issues, a significant difference in branch response was also evident on the first question.

Allow women in all specialties. Overall, Blacks tended to be somewhat 'neutral' on whether women should be allowed to serve in all combat arms specialties (Figure 37). The White perception was significantly different; Whites tended to somewhat 'disagree.'

Like other issues, the Black perspective may be rooted in the belief that denying women

'access' to any position is discriminatory.

From a branch perspective, significant differences were also observed. Combat arms

and combat support officers tended to 'disagree' with allowing women to serve in combat

arms specialties. In comparison combat service support officers were more 'neutral' in

their attitude. Thus, the implication may be that the further the respondent is away from

the "fog of battle," the more open minded the respondent is. The other implication is that

since more women are in the combat service support area (60% in the case of the survey

respondents), and since they too are undecided in their attitude, the more 'neutral' the

response.

Figure 37. Question 18: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Women should be allowed in all combat arms specialties, assuming they are fully qualified"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	32.0%	36.2%	10.5%	40.0%		35.7%	48.1%	24.0%	17.1%
Disagree	2	25.6%	28.7%	21.1%	10.0%	41.7%	24.1%	18.5%	40.0%	29.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	6.4%	5.3%	5.3%	10.0%	8.3%	5.4%	9.3%	4.0%	2.4%
Agree	4	22.4%	19.1%	42.1%	20.0%	33.3%	21.4%	11.1%	28.0%	34.1%
Strongly Agree	5	13.6%	10.6%	21.1%	20.0%	16.7%	13.4%	13.0%	4.0%	17.1%
Mean Score			2.3936	3.4211				2.2222	2.4800	3.0488

$P_{(W/B)}$ = .0044 (SD) $P_{(Br)}$ = .0208 (SD)

The written comments on these issue include:

"Also, I often feel we've missed the issue concerning females in combat. I believe in equality -- of the human being and spirit -- and I think humans, regardless of laws, rise to the moment and are allowed passage when the true need is recognized, but I think the long term issue is not equality, but values and society. Do we choose to have women turned to liver -- mush? Not about equality, but about is (sic) that the society we want -- (or need to treat others

with respect and equality) -- and is it wise to do so? WWI almost wiped out 2-3 generations of men -- what if we do the same with women? Nature is adaptable, but I doubt men will have babies any time soon! It just seems so extreme. Life is not -- in the whole -- Black and White (no pun). It is mostly shades of gray. God forbid I'm naive because I'm a white, middle-class male who's comfortable! We just seem to drive to extremes to satisfy the moment. There will always be human frailties and prejudices. Not that that is an excuse to be compliant, but did our concept of freedom and democracy, our quest for human rights mean we should (or could) abolish humanity? The good or successful or reasonable to be demolished with the evil? [Survey 12]

"Human nature makes it tough. As we downsize, this may become a 'mute' point." [Survey 77]

This question was immediately followed by whether women would ever achieve equality in the military without gaining the right to serve in all combat arms specialties.

Equality for women. Blacks tended to be 'neither agree not disagree' in their belief that women will never achieve equality in the Army until they are allowed to serve in all combat arms positions (Figure 38). Whites tended to 'disagree.' These differences in perception are significantly different. Although there is no significant difference in branch perception, the attitude of combat service support respondents were more 'neutral,' whereas, combat and combat support respondents tended to 'disagree' with this issue.

Figure 38. Question 19: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Until women are allowed in all combat arms positions, they will never achieve equality in the Army"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities/females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	28.0%	31.9%	10.5%	20.0%		30.4%	37.0%	24.0%	19.5%
Disagree	2	38.4%	39.4%	36.8%	40.0%	50.0%	37.5%	33.3%	48.0%	43.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	4.8%	5.3%		10.0%		5.4%	5.6%	4.0%	4.9%
Agree	4	16.0%	16.0%	15.8%	20.0%	8.3%	17.0%	16.7%	12.0%	19.5%
Strongly Agree	5%	12.8%	7.4%	36.8%	10.0%	41.7%	9.8%	7.4%	12.0%	12.2%
Mean Score			2.2766	3.3158				2.2407	2.4000	2.6098

$p_{(W/B)} = .0023$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .4082$ (No SD)

The next diversity issues investigated whether minorities and females were perceived to be 'too sensitive' to race and gender issues.

Minorities and female sensitivities to race/gender.

Given on-going emphasis on race and gender relations, the next three questions attempted to gauge perceptions on the sensitivities of minorities and women to race and gender. Like most of the previous issues, significant differences in responses by race exist for each of these questions, but not by branch.

Focus on Black issues vs other minority issues. When asked whether too much attention was focused on Black "minority issues" at the expense of other minorities and females, Whites tended to 'neither agree not disagree' (Figure 39). Blacks 'disagreed' outright. Moreover, 40% of Whites agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, as compared to only 11% of Blacks. The branch perception also tended to be 'neither agree not disagree.' There was no significant difference by branch, however.

46

Figure 39. Question 20: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Too much attention is focused on Black 'minority issues' at the expense of other minorities and females"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	8.8%	5.3%	31.6%		16.7%	8.0%	5.6%	4.0%	14.6%
Disagree	2	20.8%	14.9%	52.6%	20.0%	25.0%	20.5%	20.4%	20.0%	24.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	31.2%	36.2%	5.3%	30.0%	33.3%	30.4%	37.0%	32.0%	19.5%
Agree	4	32.8%	36.2%	10.5%	50.0%	25.0%	27.8%	26.9%	44.0%	36.6%
Strongly Agree	5	6.4%	7.4%				7.1%	9.3%		4.9%
Mean Score			3.2553	1.9474				3.1481	3.1600	2.9268

$p_{(W/B)} = .0000$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .5490$ (No SD)

Written comments include:

"Think the issue on Black and female is pushed. Nothing said of other religions and other race discrimination." [Survey 86]

"Minorities are not too sensitive, however, they are far too reticent in expressing their concern with how they are treated until we have an 'explosion,' i.e., Aberdeen. My concern is not that racial or sexual incidents occur, but how many occur and are unreported or enacted upon (sic). We tend to shy away from interpersonal openness, too touchy feely, but it will be needed to meet this challenge." [Survey 97]

The focus then shifted from emphasis on Black issues in particular to minorities and women sensitivities in general.

Minorities and women too sensitive. Again, significant differences in perceptions exist between Blacks and Whites (Figure 40-41). Blacks did not believe that Blacks and women were too sensitive to race and gender. Whites tended to 'neither agree nor disagree.' Likewise, the branch perception mirrored that of Whites.

Figure 40. Question 21: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Minorities are too sensitive to racial issues"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	9.6%	3.2%	47.4%		8.3%	9.8%	9.3%	8.0%	12.2%
Disagree	2	28.0%	24.5%	36.8%	40.0%	50.0%	25.9%	22.2%	24.0%	36.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	25.6%	28.7%	10.5%	20.0%	25.0%	25.0%	31.5%	20.0%	19.5%
Agree	4	30.4%	36.2%	5.3%	30.0%	16.7%	32.1%	29.6%	44.0%	24.4%
Strongly Agree	5	6.4%	7.4%		10.0%		7.1%	7.4%	4.0%	7.3%
Mean Score			3.2021	1.7368				3.0370	3.1200	2.7805

$p_{(W/B)} = .0000$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .4085$ (No SD)

Figure 41. Question 22: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Women are too sensitive to racial issues"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	8.8%	4.3%	36.8%		8.3%	8.9%	9.3%	8.0%	9.8%
Disagree	2	25.6%	21.3%	42.1%	30.0%	41.7%	24.1%	18.5%	16.0%	39.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	27.2%	27.7%	21.1%	30.0%	25.0%	26.8%	27.8%	40.0%	19.5%
Agree	4	33.6%	40.4%		40.0%	25.0%	34.8%	38.9%	32.0%	26.8%
Strongly Agree	5	4.8%	6.4%				5.4%	5.6%	4.0%	4.9%
Mean Score			3.2340	1.8421				3.1296	3.0800	2.7805

$p_{(W/B)} = .0000$ (SD) $p_{(Br)} = .2713$ (No SD)

Confederacy related questions.

The perception of the Confederate Battle Flag by Blacks and Whites was the impetus for this research project. Based on the responses received in this survey, it continues to be a contentious issue. Five Confederate Battle Flag related issues were presented. Significant differences in responses between Blacks and Whites exist on each one. In

further contrast, Black perceptions of theses issues are almost diametrically opposite to

that of Whites. None were significantly difference with respect to branch perceptions.

Confederate Battle Flag is a symbol of racism. Whites tended to be split between

'disagree' and 'neither agree not disagree' when asked whether the Confederate Battle

Flag is a present day sign of racism and discrimination (Figure 42). Only 4% of Whites

indicated it was. Over 78% of Blacks thought it was. Thus, Blacks 'strongly agreed'

with such a characterization of this flag.

Figure 42. Question 23: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "The Confederate flag is a present day symbol of racism and prejudice"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	20.0%	25.5%		10.0%	8.3%	21.4%	18.5%	16.0%	22.0%
Disagree	2	25.6%	29.8%		40.0%	33.3%	25.0%	27.8%	32.0%	22.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	13.6%	14.9%	5.3%	10.0%	33.3%	10.7%	9.3%	8.0%	22.0%
Agree	4	25.6%	25.5%	15.8%	40.0%	8.3%	27.7%	27.8%	36.0%	14.6%
Strongly Agree	5	15.2%	4.3%	78.9%		16.7%	15.2%	16.7%	8.0%	19.5%
Mean Score			2.5319	4.7368				2.9630	2.8800	2.8780

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0000 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .9477 (No SD)

As Civil War re-enactments and other related events often display the Confederate

Battle Flag, the question of whether these too were symbols of racism was asked.

Civil War re-enactments are symbols of racism. Black and White responses were

also significantly different on this issue (Figure 43). Whites tended to 'strongly disagree'

that these re-enactments had racist overtones. Blacks 'neither agreed nor disagreed' with

this statement.

Figure 43. Question 24: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Civil War re-enactments and events are a present day symbol of racism and prejudice"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	52.0%	62.8%	5.3%	40.0%	75.0%	50.0%	51.9%	56.0%	46.3%
Disagree	2	34.4%	31.9%	36.8%	60.0%		38.4%	37.0%	32.0%	36.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	10.4%	5.3%	36.8%		25.0%	8.0%	11.1%	8.0%	9.8%
Agree	4	2.4%		15.8%			2.7%		4.0%	4.9%
Strongly Agree	5	0.8%		5.3%			0.9%			2.4%
Mean Score			1.4255	2.7895				1.5926	1.6000	1.8049

$P_{(W/B)} = .0000$ (SD) $P_{(Br)} = .4190$ (No SD)

The remaining issue statements in this area involved whether it was appropriate for officers to (1) display the Confederate Battle Flag on privately owned vehicles, (2) to fly it at home, or (3) to display it in an office environment, regardless of context.

Confederate Battle Flag on vehicles. Whites tended to 'neither agree or disagree' more than 'agree' with the statement that it was inappropriate for officers to display the Confederate Battle Flag on their privately owned vehicles (Figure 44). Although they viewed the flag as not racist in nature, this attitude was apparently in deference to its perception as such by Blacks. Blacks tended to 'strongly agree' that it was inappropriate to display the flag on officer vehicles.

Figure 44. Question 25: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "It is not appropriate for officers to display Confederate flag decals on their privately owned vehicles"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	10.4%	12.8%	5.3%			11.6%	14.8%	4.0%	7.3%
Disagree	2	11.2%	12.8%		20.0%	8.3%	11.6%	9.3%	16.0%	12.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	15.2%	16.0%	5.3%	20.0%	25.0%	13.4%	16.7%	24.0%	7.3%
Agree	4	32.8%	38.3%	5.3%	40.0%	33.3%	33.0%	31.5%	28.0%	36.6%
Strongly Agree	5	30.4%	20.2%	84.2%	20.0%	33.3%	30.4%	27.8%	28.0%	36.6%
Mean Score			3.4043	4.6316				3.4815	3.6000	3.8293

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0002 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .4372 (No SD)

Flying the Confederate Battle Flag at home. Whites also tended to be split between 'neither agree nor disagree' and 'agree' on the statement that it was inappropriate for officers to fly the Confederate Battle Flag at their private quarters (Figure 45). As with the previous issue, this attitude was apparently in deference to its perception of being racist by Blacks. The Black response was significantly different in that Blacks tended to 'strongly agree' with this statement.

Figure 45. Question 26: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "It is not appropriate for officers to fly the Confederate flag outside their private quarters"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		125	94	19	10	12	112	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	7.2%	8.5%	5.3%			8.0%	11.1%		4.9%
Disagree	2	12.0%	13.8%		20.0%	8.3%	12.5%	9.3%	20.0%	12.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	12.8%	12.8%	5.3%	20.0%	8.3%	12.5%	16.7%	8.0%	9.8%
Agree	4	34.4%	40.4%	5.3%	40.0%	50.0%	33.0%	29.6%	44.0%	34.1%
Strongly Agree	5	33.6%	24.5%	84.2%	20.0%	33.3%	33.9%	33.3%	28.0%	39.0%
Mean Score			3.5851	4.6316				3.6481	3.8000	3.9024

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0008 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .6070 (No SD)

Display of Confederate Battle Flag in office. As to whether it is inappropriate for officers to display the Confederate flag in their offices, regardless of whether it is a memento flag, a part of a painting, or embedded in a paper weight, Blacks tended to 'strongly agree' that it was inappropriate to do so (Figure 46). Whites, on the other hand, were solid in 'neither agree nor disagree.' Presumably, this White explains why the class leadership commissioned a Civil War art print, without a Confederate Battle Flag, as its gift to the United States Army War College.

Figure 46. Question 27: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "It is not appropriate for officers to display the Confederate flag in their offices (as memento flags, paintings, paper weights, etc)"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	92	19	10	12	110	54	24	40
Strongly Disagree	1	13.8%	15.2%	5.3%	10.0%		15.5%	14.8%	8.3%	12.5%
Disagree	2	25.2%	30.4%		30.0%	16.7%	26.4%	31.5%	25.0%	20.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	13.0%	14.1%	5.3%	10.0%	25.0%	10.9%	11.1%	33.3%	2.5%
Agree	4	25.2%	27.2%	15.8%	30.0%	25.0%	25.5%	20.4%	25.0%	30.0%
Strongly Agree	5	22.8%	13.0%	73.7%	20.0%	33.3%	21.8%	22.2%	8.3%	35.0%
Mean Score			2.9239	4.5263				3.0370	3.0000	3.5500

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .0000 (SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .1531 (No SD)

These Confederate Battle Flag issues received the most survey comments. Below are representatives of those comments. As demonstrated by the responses, the issue is quite emotional and presents somewhat of a dichotomy in relation to other perceptions of racism.

"The displaying of the Confederate flag is not that big a deal. It is blown out of proportion." [Survey 6]

"To argue that the representation of a Civil War-era Confederate flag in a historically-correct piece of artwork is 'racist' is absolutely ludicrous. Here,

again, the Army appears to be ready to be held hostage to a vocal minority with little fundamental understanding of that time." [Survey 8]

"I grew up thinking of the Confederate flag in no context other than that of military history, i.e., not a racial one. It is in difference to the perception of others and to its misuse by hate groups that I feel that it is inappropriate to display it." [Survey 13]

"Racist, prejudicial presentation of survey. Why not ask about Malcolm X prejudice as worn by blacks? Why just focus on Confederate symbol? Why not Nazi symbol? Appears author is biased, not objective and already has reached conclusions. Simply looking for data to support a preassumed theory. Bet you don't show this to the SRP chair. Invalid survey." [Survey 16]

"The debate over the (Confederate flag) is, in reality, a surrogate for the debate we are not having in this country or in the Army over serious racial divisions. It is an argument that very sadly places symbol over substance." [Survey 23]

"Depends on your frame of reference. I view it as a symbol of a defeated way of life, losers. Our Civil War stands as an example to the world that the U.S. can right wrongs in our society. Freedom for all carries a price, thousands of lives lost. In my mind, these re-enactment ensure we never forget the price we paid." [Survey 45]

"If someone is so inclined, they can make the Bible a symbol of racism and prejudice." [Survey 88]

"History happened; it won't go away just by ignoring it! The Civil War should be a celebration of liberation, not a symbol of racism and prejudice." [Survey 93]

"The Civil War is part of America's history. Although slavery was an issue it was not the only one. States rights was the primary cause of S.C. departure from the Union. Therefore, the (war) was fought to end slavery and unify the Union. Pictures that represent major battles are not racist just because a rebel flag is in the picture." [Survey 108]

Homosexuals and the Army.

The last diversity issue surveyed involved homosexuals in the Army. Many

respondents questioned the inclusion of this subject as a diversity issue. Given the two

questions, no significant differences exist between responses by race. Between branch responses, however, significant differences exist on one issue -- comparing the current policy of not allowing 'acknowledged' homosexuals the right to serve to the old 'segregation' policy before Blacks were allowed to fully serve.

Future Army policies on 'acknowledged' homosexuals. Both Blacks and Whites were 'neutral' on whether 'acknowledged' homosexuals will be allowed to serve in the Army within the next 20 years (Figure 47). Considering that President Bill Clinton tried to implement such a policy at the beginning of his first term in office, the respondents likely feel that it is simply a matter of time before this happens. That does not mean, however, that they are for such a decision. They simply recognize that the decision is not theirs to make.

Figure 47. Question 28: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "The Army will allow 'acknowledged' homosexuals to serve in the military within the next 20 years"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	18	10	11	111	54	25	41
Strongly Disagree	1	15.4%	17.2%	5.6%	10.0%		16.2%	22.2%	12.5%	7.3%
Disagree	2	26.0%	21.5%	33.3%	60.0%	18.2%	27.0%	29.6%	33.3%	19.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	13.0%	15.1%	5.6%	10.0%	18.2%	12.6%	7.4%	16.7%	19.5%
Agree	4	38.2%	38.7%	50.0%	20.0%	36.4%	38.7%	33.3%	37.5%	46.3%
Strongly Agree	5	7.3%	7.5%	5.6%		27.3%	5.4%	7.4%		7.3%
Mean Score			2.9785	3.1667					2.7407	2.7917	3.2683

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .5602 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .0941 (No SD)

Homosexual vs segregation policy. In this final question, the respondents were asked to compare the old segregation policy to the new homosexual policy (Figure 48).

In doing so, both Blacks and Whites tended to 'disagree' with the statement that the

current policy of denying 'acknowledged' homosexuals the right to serve in the Army is

the same as the policy used to deny Blacks the right to serve in the military prior to

integration. Given that their overall responses were the same, there was no significant

difference in perception between their two viewpoints.

When viewed from the perspective of branch, however, that was not the case.

Although each branch disagreed with this statement, combat service support respondents

were not as strong in their conviction on this issue as were the combat arms and combat

support respondents.

Figure 48. Question 29: To what extent do you agree or disagree with, "Denying 'acknowledged'
homosexuals the right to serve in the military is the same as denying Blacks the right to serve prior to
integration"? (Shaded areas for 'Other' minorities and females represent insufficient responses for
determination of statistically valid conclusions).

	Scale	Overall	Whites	Blacks	Others	Females	Males	Combat Arms	Combat Support	Combat Svc Spt
Respondents		123	93	18	10	11	111	54	24	41
Strongly Disagree	1	61.8%	62.4%	61.1%	60.0%	18.2%	65.8%	70.4%	75.0%	43.9%
Disagree	2	24.4%	25.8%	16.7%	30.0%	36.4%	23.4%	18.5%	25.0%	34.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	4.1%	3.2%	.	10.0%	9.1%	3.6%	5.6%		2.4%
Agree	4	7.3$%	6.5%	16.7%		18.2%	6.3%	3.7%		14.6%
Strongly Agree	5	2.4%	2.2%	5.6%		18.2%	0.9%	1.9%		4.9%
Mean Score			1.6022	1.8889				1.4815	1.2500	2.0244

$p_{(W/B)}$ = .2910 (No SD) $p_{(Br)}$ = .0037 (SD)

The responses to the questions on the selected diversity issues illustrate the degree of

divisiveness between Blacks and Whites. With the exception of the sexual harassment

and homosexual issues, virtually every other issue portrayed not only significant

differences in Black and White perceptions, but also differences which were essentially in

direct opposition to each other. Furthermore, as these issues have been highlighted, yet unresolved, in recent years, these are the issues likely to cause much consternation between Blacks and Whites. These issues are not generally contentious, however, from a branch perspective.

Conclusions

When it comes to diversity issues in the Army, especially the ones addressed in this research, there is a cultural divide in Black and White perceptions. Whites see a largely harmonious racial environment in the Army. Blacks see it as harmonious too, but to a lesser extent. Blacks do not believe that Army equal opportunity policies have created an equal environment for them, other minorities, and females. Whites think the Army's policies have gone beyond being equal "to the point of reverse discrimination." Whites believe that Blacks have been helped to a great extent by these policies. Blacks believe that discrimination is still prevalent. Blacks believe there is nothing wrong with 'minority-based' professional development organizations. Whites are somewhat neutral, with a strong undercurrent saying these organizations are in themselves racist. Whites believe in a color-blind system for selecting leaders for schooling, assignments, and promotions. Blacks do not trust the system or the leadership to be color-blind -- at least not yet anyway. Blacks believe all positions in the Army should be open to women. Whites do not agree. Whites do not see the Confederate Battle Flag as racist. The Confederate Battle Flag is racist to Blacks. Most of these differences in perception are significant.

Blacks and Whites do agree on a number of diversity issues, however. Both are neutral in acknowledging that 'homosexuals' will be allowed to serve honorably in the military within the next 20 years. Both agree on resolution strategies for sexual harassment (strong enforcement through use of the military judicial system, greater emphasis on respect and consideration training, and assignment of more female drill sergeants to training units). Both agree that the Army's equal opportunity policies were designed to help Blacks, and that Whites have been helped least by these policies, but not necessarily hurt in the process. Both agree that gender relations in the Army are' better' than in the civilian community, but not 'much better.'

These results support the author's thesis that there are significant differences in perceptions and attitudes between Blacks and Whites on a host of diversity issues. As exhibited and discussed, significant differences exist in over 50% of the issues surveyed. Unfortunately, due to insufficient data, no such valid conclusion could be proffered based on 'Other' minorities and female perceptions.

In either case as the future strategic leaders in this research study transition to higher echelons of command and authority in the Army hierarchy, they will develop and implement policies affecting diversity. If the Army leadership portrays the prevailing attitude of 'Whites' toward these policies, equal opportunity programs and 'safeguards' will likely be eliminated or severely curtailed. As many Blacks will likely continue to rely on equal opportunity policies for protection, they will ultimately become alienated. If the leadership portrays the prevailing attitude of 'Blacks' toward these policies, these equal opportunity and treatment programs will likely continue, thus contributing further

to White discontent with 'reverse discrimination.' The Army must take action now to ensure that the Total Force understands and wholeheartedly supports its diversity policies.

RECOMMENDATION

At a basic level, all servicemen -- commissioned officers, warrant officers noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel -- know the Army's policy on equal opportunity and treatment for all soldiers, regardless of race or sex. Unquestionably, all senior leaders know, believe in, and support this Army goal. How the Army seeks to attain that goal is an area of much concern though. That is where confusion and discord abounds. Therefore, the Army must do a better job of explaining and reinforcing its policies to its leaders. More importantly, that explanation must include why that is the Army's policy.

As a result, the Army must take a straight-forward position on the issues discussed in this research project; it must openly discuss that position with its leaders; and it must provide adequate rationale for that position. In other words, what is the Army's perception of and attitude toward the following questions:

- How does the Army perceive its racial and gender climate? What indicators does it use in judging this climate? What are the results of those indicators?

- What is the overall minority and female composition of the Army (officer, warrant officer, noncommissioned officer, enlisted)? What is the minority and female composition of the Army by grade and by branch (officer, warrant officer, NCO, enlisted)? How have these trends changed over the years?

- Does the Army believe its soldiers should be more representative of the minorities and females in the general population it is charged with defending? Should its leaders (at all ranks) be more representative of the minority and female composition of the active Army, or representative of the general population? If so, how does the Army "manage" this, if at all?

- How have minorities and females faired on recent promotion and school selection boards? What is the critical "competition point" for minorities and females? How often and to what extent, if at all, do promotion and school selection boards "move" minorities and females "above the line"? Are selections based on "best qualified only" or are the diversity needs of the Army applied to select other "fully qualified" soldiers (e.g., minorities and females) over "better qualified" White males?

- What is the Army's position on the display of the Confederate Battle Flag, the Nazi flag, the 'Black flag', the Malcolm X symbol, and other perceived symbols of racism? What is the Army's position on minority and female officer participation in 'select' professional development organizations?

These questions are extremely sensitive and must be handled delicately, but they must be handled. Undoubtedly, White soldiers discuss these questions and issues amongst themselves. Black soldiers also discuss them in great detail, but amongst themselves. On the occasions when these issues are discussed openly, the discussion is usually based on partial, incomplete, or downright erroneous information. The Army needs to supply the correct information and to moderate the discussion. The evidence tends to indicate that that is not happening.

As a minimum, all commanders at battalion and above level, must be educated on these issues and the Army's position. As senior leaders and senior raters, these are the commanders most able to positively affect and impact not only the racial and gender

59

climate in the unit today, but also the racial and gender composition of the Army leadership tomorrow.

Since each of these senior level commanders should attend a pre-command course immediately before assumption of command, the pre-command courses afford the Army an excellent opportunity to address this information. Additionally, the senior service colleges, the Army War College in particular, provide another excellent opportunity for these issues to be further disseminated and debated.

Full implementation of this recommendation ensures that all leaders, not just strategic leaders, see the Army's 'big picture,' understand its goals, and hopefully support its strategies, whatever they may be, for accomplishing those goals. Then and only then will the discord in the ranks be silenced.

SUMMARY

Although neither all Blacks nor all Whites (or any other ethnic or gender group) are singular in their respective views, there exists significant differences in their perceptions of Army diversity issues. These differences in perception, as evidenced in the results of this research, display a strong undercurrent of discontent with current Army equal opportunity policies. These diversity issues will become even more important, and contentious, as the Army moves deeper into the 21st century -- a century wherein the majority today becomes the minority by 2050. Unless the Army makes a concerted effort to educate its leaders on its diversity, its equal opportunity goals, and its strategies for attaining those goals, the extent of this discord will only increase. The Army can ill afford such distractions in times of diminishing resources and increased responsibilities.

ENDNOTES

[1] Throughout this report the author uses Black(s) in lieu of African-American(s) and White(s) in lieu of Caucasian(s). Additionally, he prefers to use each as proper nouns and thus capitalizes the first letter.

[2] Lani Guinier, The Tyranny of the Majority: Fundamental Fairness in Representative Democracy (New York: The Free Press, 1994), 2.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 3.

[5] The Black students had numerous discussions of this issue in their informal organization. They understood that this issue was not new, but was a recurring issue for Blacks attending previous USAWC classes. As a result, they attempted to steer the gift selection in other than art print directions. When that failed, they attempted to steer the theme in non-Civil War directions. Although enjoying some initial success in the early rounds of popular voting, they were ineffective in deciding the ultimate outcome of the type of gift or the theme for the art print.

[6] Guinier, 3.

[7] Ibid., 5.

[8] Memorandum by Major General H.E. Ely, Commandant, U.S. Army War College on "The Use of Negro Man Power in War" (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 1925), para III(1).

[9] Ibid., para IV(8)-(14).

[10] The U.S. President's Committee on "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services." Freedom to Serve (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1950), 7.

[11] Peter G. Nordie, Black and White Perceptions of the Army's Equal Opportunity and Treatment Programs (McLean, VA: Human Sciences Research, Inc, April 1973), iv-v.

[12] Ibid.

[13] "Equal Opportunity: DOD Studies on Discrimination in the Military" (Letter Report, 04/07/95, GAO/NSIAD-95-103). Available on the Internet at "http://www-tradoc.monroe.army.mil/irac/gao/reports/text/ns95103.txt".

[14] Anthony W. Robinson, "The Affirmative Action Debate." Emerge 8 (November 1996): 66.

[15] The survey was developed with the support of Colonel Morris Price (Director, Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of Command, Leadership, and Management) and Dr. Glenda Y. Nogami (Director, Curriculum Research, Department of Academic Affairs) of the U.S. Army War College.

[16] Each response to each question was assigned a numerical score/scale -- beginning with one (1) for the most negative response and progressing to the most positive response. This enabled the mean score for each question to be calculated.

[17] Based on the quantity of surveys from Whites (94 returned for a response rate of 49%) and Blacks (19 returned for a response rate of 76%), sufficient data exists to proffer statistically valid conclusions on White and Black senior leader perceptions on the diversity issues surveyed. Even though the survey requested racial data on other minority groups in the target audience (Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, and others), their responses were combined into an overall 'Others' category. As the population of this 'Others' groups was still quite small (10), significant fluctuations in perceptions (as expressed by percentages) was evident. Thus, the data for 'Others' is presented, but no comments are offered as to their overall perceptions. For the same reason, data on the type of service (120 military versus 4 civilians) and the component of military service (120 Regular Army versus 1 National Guard) was not presented. Sufficient responses were obtained, however, for analysis of the data by branch of service (combat, combat support, combat service support) and that data is presented.

[18] Dr. Glenda Nogami (See Endnote #15) supplied the statistical analyses of the survey.

[19] Celeste McCollough, Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), 46.

[20] Each survey comment is followed by a survey number for cross-referencing purposes. Survey numbers were added to the survey *after* they were returned.

[21] Neither promotion/school quotas or set-asides are Army policy. The following information is representative of instructions provided each promotion and school selection board, however: "In evaluating the files of the officers you are about to consider, be alert to the possibility of past personal or institutional discrimination--either intentional or inadvertent--in the assignment patterns, evaluations, or professional development of officers in those (minority and female) groups for which you have an equal opportunity selection goal. This goal will not be interpreted as guidance to meet a particular 'quota.' Comparison of tentative selection rates to the goal offers you a

diagnostic tool to ensure that all officers receive equal opportunity in the selection process." (DA Memorandum 600-2, Policies and Procedures for Active Component Officer Selection Boards, 26 November 1993.)

[22] Discrimination was purposely not defined in the survey. Responses could include racial and/or gender discrimination.

[23] Mentoring was purposely not defined in the survey.

[24] Sexual harassment was purposely not defined in the survey.

[25] "Respect and Consideration for Others" training refers to General Reimer's (Chief of Staff of the Army) initiative to reduce sexual harassment; it is to be modeled after training at the United States Military Academy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Butler, Remo. "Why Black Officers Fail in the U.S. Army" (A Strategy Research Project paper submitted to the United States Army War College). Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1996.

Davidson, Joe. "Target for Scrutiny." Emerge 8, no. 1 (October 1996), p. 38-44.

Department of the Army Memorandum 600-2, Policies and Procedures for Active Component Officer Selection Boards, 26 November 1993.

Ely, H.E., Major General, Commandant, U.S. Army War College. "The Use of Negro Man Power in War." Memorandum for Army Chief of Staff. Carlisle Barracks, PA: 30 October 1925.

Fraser, Steven, ed. The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America. New York: BasicBooks, 1995.

Gilens, Martin. "Racial Attitudes and Opposition to Welfare." The Journal of Politics 57, no. 4 (November 1995): 994-1014.

Gordon, James E. "Influences in the Making of Black Strategic Leaders" (A Strategic Research Project paper submitted to the United States Army War College). Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1996.

Guinier, Lani. The Tyranny of the Majority: Fundamental Fairness in Representative Democracy. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Hawley, Willis D., and Anthony W. Jackson, eds. Toward a Common Destiny: Improing Race and Ethnic Relations in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.

Herrnstein, Richard J., and Charles Murray. The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Human Rights Watch. Human Rights Watch World Report, 1996. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1995.

McCollough, Celeste. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Morrell, Jr., Kenneth A. "The Future of Affirmative Action" (A Strategic Research Project paper submitted to the United States Army War College). Carlisle Barracks, PA: 1996.

Nordie, Peter G. Black and White Perceptions of the Army's Equal Opportunity and Treatment Programs. McLean, VA: Human Sciences Research, Inc., April 1973.

Robinson, Anthony W. "The Affirmative Action Debate." Emerge 8, no. 2 (November 1996), p. 66-72.

Roth, Byron M. Prescription for Failure: Race Relations in the Age of Social Science. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1994.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, and Lawrence Bobo. Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

U.S. Government Accounting Office, "Equal Opportunity: DOD Studies on Discrimination in the Military." Letter report (GAO/NSIAD-95-103) prepared April 7, 1995 for Ranking Minority Member, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives. <http://www-tradoc.monroe.army.mil/irac/gao/reports/text/ns95103.txt>. 9 February 1997.

U.S. President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services. Freedom to Serve. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.